



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/558,547	10/23/2006	Hong Lin	CN920030005US1	5750
68168 7590 07/02/2009 MICHAEL BUCHENHORN, P.A. 8540 SW 83 STREET SUITE 100 MIAMI, FL 33143				
EXAMINER				
PITT, BRYAN W				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2617				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/02/2009		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

michael@buchenhomer.com  
ana@buchenhomer.com  
AnaBuch@gmail.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/558,547

**Applicant(s)**

LIN ET AL.

**Examiner**

Bryan Pitt

**Art Unit**

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 March 2009.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 21-32 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 21-32 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 March 2009 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. Applicant's amendment was received 25 March 2009 and has been processed. Claim 1 was pending and was canceled. New claims 21-32 were added. The drawings were amended. The specification was amended to correct some minor issues. Claims 21-32 are pending.

### ***Drawings***

2. The drawings were received on 25 March 2009. Examiner respectfully submits that these drawings are not acceptable. Specifically, Fig. 1 – which shows a SMS interface presented on a user terminal – is not acceptable because the images and/or words shown are illegible. Fig. 6 – which shows logic models of the interactive controller according to an embodiment of the present invention – is not acceptable because the images and/or words shown on the controllers are illegible and the details are obscured.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 21-32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 21, 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
6. Claim 21 recites the limitation "in response to *the* user interaction" in line 25. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
7. Claim 25 recites the limitation "user selection of *the* control element" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Specifically, it is not known whether this control element is the "selected one of the plurality of the control elements" (recited in lines 27-28 of claim 21) or another control element.
8. Claim 26 recites the limitation "changing *the* control element" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Specifically, it is not known whether this control element is the "selected one of the plurality of the control elements" (recited in lines 27-28 of claim 21) or another control element.
9. Claim 27 recites the limitation "wherein *the* relationship" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11. Claims 21-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 2002/0029243 to Melet et al. (hereafter "Melet").

Regarding claim 21, Melet teaches a user terminal comprising:  
a graphical user interface comprising a display and a user input device (i.e. a user computer (terminal) displays a web page, therefore comprising a display; paragraph 0074. The user interacts with web page and inputs text into text fields of the web page, therefore comprising a user input device; paragraph 0076);  
a multimedia message module comprising:

a communication module operable for receiving a multimedia message from a server (i.e. user computer (terminal) receives a host web page (multimedia message) transmitted by a host server, therefore a communication module), said multimedia message comprising:

a presentation portion (i.e. the web page (multimedia message) is encoded using Dynamic HTML; paragraph 0075. HTML documents contain tags that define how to present the informational content, therefore comprising a presentation portion; paragraph 0013),

message data content (i.e. HTML documents contain informational (data) content; paragraph 0013),

a plurality of embedded control elements (i.e. Fig. 1a shows a received web page (multimedia message) with text fields and a "send" button, therefore comprising a plurality of embedded control elements; paragraph 0040), and

corresponding rules governing the plurality of control elements (i.e. HTML tags also define linking attributes of informational content, therefore rules governing the plurality of control elements; paragraph 0013. For example, when the "send" button is clicked the presentation of the web page (multimedia message) is changed; paragraph 0041);

a parser module operable for:

    parsing the multimedia message to separate the presentation portion of the multimedia message (i.e. the web page (multimedia message) is received in the form of an HTML based document which a browser on the user computer parses to interpret the HTML tags (presentation portion) in order to display the document; paragraph 0013. In parsing the HTML document, the browser is able to distinguish between tag (presentation portion) and informational content, therefore separating the presentation portion);

    parsing the presentation portion to generate a presentation structure governing how to present the multimedia message (i.e. the HTML tags (presentation portion) are interpreted (parsed) to define the presentation of the web page (multimedia message), therefore generating a presentation structure governing how to present the multimedia message; paragraph 0013);

    parsing the corresponding rules to separate them from the multimedia message (i.e. the browser also parses HTML tags that define linking attributes of informational content, therefore parsing the corresponding rules; paragraph 0013. In parsing the HTML document, the browser is able to distinguish between

tag (rules) and informational content, therefore separating the corresponding rules);

generating an action form by embedding the corresponding rules for extending operability of said plurality of control elements to support multimedia objects (i.e. Melet teaches that a browser on the user computer parses and interprets DHTML documents to display received web pages (multimedia messages); paragraph 0013, 0016, 0072, 0074-0075. It is inherent that the steps of parsing, interpreting, and displaying DHTML code include the step of generating an action form as evidenced by Perry, Greg; "SAMS Teach Yourself Beginning Programming in 24 Hours," Sams Publishing, Printed November 2001 (hereafter "Perry"). Perry teaches that as a browser parses and interprets a DHTML based web page, it creates a Document Object Model (DOM) (i.e. a action form) which keeps track of the objects in the web page and their properties (see Perry page 353, last paragraph to page 354, first paragraph; and page 355, last paragraph). The DOM allows the DHTML to manipulate the objects in response to the user's actions (see Perry page 356, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph); therefore an action form for extending operability of control elements to multimedia objects). an interactive module operable for:

generating a data model of the presentation structure based on the parsed presentation structure, according to a message format of the presentation structure (i.e. the browser parses the HTML tags of the HTML document and

displays the document according to the specifications in the tags, therefore generating a data model; paragraph 0013),

loading the message data content into the data model for generating a message page (i.e. the browser displays the informational content of the HTML document as specified by the HTML tags, therefore loading the message data content; paragraph 0013);

presenting the generated message page on the display for user interaction (i.e. the browser displays the HTML document, therefore presenting the generated message page; paragraph 0013);

generating an action event in response to the user interaction (i.e. when the user clicks the send button the HTML document presentation changes, therefore generating an action event; paragraphs 0013, 0041);

processing the action event based on the action form in order to enable the user to operate on the presented message page using a selected one of the plurality of the control elements (i.e. when the user clicks the send button the HTML document presentation changes, therefore processing the action event; paragraphs 0013, 0041); and

generating a corresponding action (i.e. when the user clicks the send button the HTML document presentation changes, therefore generating a corresponding action; paragraph 0013, 0041).

Regarding claim 22, Melet teaches the user terminal of claim 21 further comprising a storage module operable for storing the multimedia message within the



terminal (i.e. Melet teaches receiving a web page (multimedia message) from a server and then parsing, interpreting, and displaying the web page; paragraphs 0013, 0072, 0074. In order to parse and display the web page, there must needs be a memory or buffer (storage module) within the user computer for storing the received web page (multimedia message), therefore comprising a storage module).

Regarding claim 23, Melet teaches the user terminal of claim 21 wherein the action form comprises a name and current value of the plurality of control elements (i.e. Melet teaches that a browser on the user computer parses and interprets DHTML documents to display received web pages (multimedia messages); paragraph 0013, 0016, 0072, 0074-0075. It is inherent that the steps of parsing, interpreting, and displaying DHTML code include the step of generating an action form that comprises a name and current value of the control elements as evidenced by Perry. Perry teaches that as a browser parses and interprets a DHTML based web page, it creates a Document Object Model (DOM) (i.e. a action form) which keeps track of the names and properties (current values) of the embedded objects (control elements) in the web page (multimedia message; see Perry page 353, last paragraph to page 354, first paragraph; and page 355, last paragraph).

Regarding claim 24, Melet teaches the user terminal of claim 23 wherein the user input device and the display are operable for enabling the user to select from among the plurality of control elements (i.e. the user is able to select a menu item in a pull-down menu, enter text in a text field, and click a send button (all different control elements),

therefore enabling the user to select from among the plurality of control elements; paragraph 0056)

Regarding claim 25, Melet teaches the user terminal of claim 24 wherein user selection of the control element determines the presentation structure (i.e. by clicking the send button (user selection of a control element) the interactive dialog box changes from a first revolution to a second revolution with a different appearance and/or set of control elements, therefore the selection determines the presentation structure; paragraph 0057, Figs. 3a and 3b).

Regarding claim 26, Melet teaches the user terminal of claim 21 wherein the corresponding action further comprises an action selected from a group consisting of: modifying the message data content on the message page on the user terminal, changing the control element, and interacting with the server on a basis of the message page (i.e. when the user clicks the send button the web page (message) presentation (data content) changes, therefore modifying the message data content on the message page; paragraph 0041, Figs. 2a and 2b).

Regarding claim 27, Melet teaches the user terminal of claim 21 wherein the relationship between the plurality of control elements comprises at least one of a LINK relationship and a CONTAIN relationship (i.e. the send button (item 116) of Fig. 1a has a LINK relationship with data fields 112, 114, and 118 in that when the send button is clicked (selected), it and the data fields are replaced (i.e. also selected) with the second revolution (item 120 of Fig. 1b), therefore a LINK relationship; paragraph 0041).

Regarding claim 28, Melet teaches the user terminal of claim 27, wherein the plurality of control elements comprises at least one interactive controller selected from a group consisting of: a submit button, a select button, a radio button, a check box, a text input field, a list box, a scroll bar, and an option menu (i.e. Melet teaches a text input field; Fig. 1a item 114).

Regarding claim 29, Melet teaches the user terminal of claim 21, wherein the multimedia message is in a language form selected from a group consisting of: XForms, XML, SMIL, XHTML, and HTML (i.e. Melet teaches receiving a web page (multimedia message) in the form of a Dynamic HTML document; paragraph 0075. DHTML is an enhanced version of HTML; therefore the web page (multimedia message) is in a language form of HTML).

Regarding claim 30, Melet teaches the user terminal of claim 21 wherein the interactive module is further operable for triggering the action event to generate the corresponding action of modifying the message data content by operating on the selected control element (i.e. when the user clicks (triggers an action event) the send button (a selected control element) the web page appearance (message data content) changes (is modified), therefore triggering the action event by operating (i.e. clicking) on the selected control element; paragraph 0041, Figs. 2a and 2b).

Regarding claim 31, Melet teaches the user terminal of claim 21 wherein the message format comprises at least one of: a text format, an audio format, and a video format (i.e. Fig. 1a shows a web page (message) containing text, therefore comprising at least a text format).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Melet in view of US 2004/0001476 to Islam et al. (hereafter "Islam").

Regarding claim 32, Melet teaches the user terminal of claim 21 but does not specifically teach wherein said user terminal is a mobile telephone. However, at the time the invention was made the preceding limitation was known in the art of communications.

Islam teaches loading dynamic web pages on mobile devices, such as cellular phones, in order to capitalize on the ability of these devices to access and share information from remote locations at the user's convenience (paragraphs 0001-0003). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the user computer as taught by Melet with a cellular phone as taught by Islam in order to take advantage of the mobility offered by cellular phones.

***Conclusion***

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bryan Pitt whose telephone number is (571) 270-7466. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30 am - 5:00 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, George Eng can be reached on (571) 272-7495. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/George Eng/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/B. P./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2617